1	BEFORE THE POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD			
2	STATE OF WASHINGTON			
3	COMET TRAILER MANUFACTURING			
4	CORPORATION,	PCHB NO. 91-121		
5	Appellant,			
6	<b>v.</b>	ORDER GRANTING		
7	STATE OF WASHINGTON,	RECONSIDERATION AND MODIFYING FINAL ORDER		
8	DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY,			
9	Respondent.			
10	)			
11		I		
12	The Pollution Control Hearings Board ("Board") on August 13, 1992, read the parties			
13	the following ruling:			
14	Having heard witness' testimony, examined exhibits, listened to the tapes of the			
15	proceedings, read post-hearing briefs, and deliberated, the Board has reached this decision:			
16	·	Order No. DE 90-C281 is affirmed at		
17	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ovided that Comet Trailer Manufacturing ardous waste laws for three years from		
18	the issuance of the final order.	and the same same same same same same same sam		
19	As the prevailing party, Kathy Gerla	is requested to write a Proposed Findings		
20	of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order for the Board's review by September			
21	10, 1992.			
22	On December 24, 1992, the Department of Ecology ("Ecology") filed the proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law with the Board.			
23	proposed a second			
24				
25				
26		т		
27	ORDER GRANTING RECONSIDERATION AND MODIFYING FINAL ORDER	Y		

(1)

PCHB No. 91-121

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

1

П

Comet Trailer Manufacturing Corporation ("Comet Trailer") received this document from Ecology, on December 28, 1992.

Ш

The Board, on December 31, 1992, signed and entered the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order, as proposed.

IV

Ecology filed a Motion for Reconsideration on January 6, 1993, averring that it had inadvertently failed to include the text of Conclusion of Law XXIV in the proposed order. Ecology pointed out that Conclusion of Law XXIV was supported by Finding of Fact XX.

V

Comet Trailer filed its response to Ecology's motion on January 14, 1993. Comet Trailer objected, arguing that it had not violated the generator record keeping requirement of WAC 173-303-210(2), which at the time of the alleged violation directed each generator to:

keep a copy of each annual report and exception report as required by WAC 173-303-220 for a period of at least three years...

VI

On January 21, 1993, Ecology submitted its Reply to Comet Trailer's response. This filing was late; accordingly, we do not consider this reply in reaching our result from the due date of each report.

VΠ

We disagree with Comet Trailer's argument. Finding of Fact XX states:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The regulation has subsequently been amended to require that such reports be kept for five years. WAC 173-303-210(2), Order 90-42, filed 3/7/91.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

27

During the September 25 inspection, Comet Trailer was unable to produce a copy of its 1987 form 4 Generator Annual Dangerous Waste Report. At the time of the inspection, Steve Owens indicated Comet Trailer did not have a copy. The due date of the report was March 1, 1988.

At the hearing, Comet Trailer produced a copy of a 1987 Form 4, which Steve Owens testified had been misplaced at the time of inspection. The section of the form that required a signed certification under penalty of perjury was not signed on the form submitted. Mr. Owens changed his story several times during questioning at the hearing, and we do not find his testimony to be credible. We also do not find the Form 4 submitted at the hearing to be a copy of the signed Form 4 submitted to Ecology. We find that Comet Trailer failed to keep a copy of the 1987 Form 4 Annual Dangerous Waste Report submitted to Ecology for three years from the due date of the report (emphasis added).

### VIII

Conclusion of Law XXIV, is blank, except for the title: "Recordkeeping". It is obvious that the author intended something to be written in Conclusion of Law XXIV. The language proposed by Ecology, for Conclusion of Law XXIV is as follows:

We conclude Comet Trailer did not keep a copy of its 1987 Form 4 Generator Annual Dangerous Waste Report for three years from the date of that report, in violation of WAC 173-303-210(2). (See Finding of Fact XX.) The incomplete unsigned copy of the form submitted at the hearing does not meet the requirements of the rule. WAC 173-303-210(2) requires generators to "keep a copy of each arrival report." (Emphasis added.) WAC 173-303-270(1) requires annual reports to be submitted according to the instructions on the form which includes a signed certification. WAC 173-303-210(2) can reasonably be interpreted to require a generator to keep a copy of the final, completed forms required to be submitted to Ecology. Allowing generators to keep copies of drafts or incomplete forms frustrates the purpose of the recordkeeping requirement.

## IX

This language is supported by Finding of Fact XX; WAC 173-303-220(1), which requires that the form be submitted "according to the instructions thereon," which form

1 requires a signed certification under penalty of perjury, and WAC 173-303-210(2), which 2 requires that the generator keep a copy of the form, "as required by WAC 173-303-220. 3 X 4 Comet Trailer argues that it should be excused from the signature requirement, 5 because, it contends, no reason has been established for the importance of keeping a signed 6 copy. Comet Trailer's Response at 3. However, a careful reading of these regulations 7 discloses that they do impose such a requirement. 8 XI 9 Comet Trailer's argument, could be regarded as a challenge to Ecology's regulation. 10 The regulation is presumed valid and subject to the following test: 11 Where the Legislature has specifically delegated to an administrator the power 12 to make regulations, such regulations are presumed valid. The burden of overcoming this presumption lies on the challenger. Judicial review is limited 13 to a determination of whether the regulation is reasonably consistent with the 14 statute being implemented. 15 Oregon Nat'l Ins. Co. v. Marquardt, 115 Wn.2d 416, 423, 799 P.2d 235 (1990). Accord, 16 .• P. 2d \_\_\_\_\_ 17 No. 12332-4- III, at 6 (Div. III, Court of Appeals, filed January 14, 1993) <sup>2</sup> 18 XII 19 RCW 70.105.130(2)(e) grants Ecology specific rule-making authority to promulgate 20 regulations to: 21 22 A broader standard of review may be applicable where one is challenging, under RCW 34 05 570(2)(C), whether the regulation "could not conceivably have been the product of a rational decision-maker" See Chamber 23 of Commerce v Department of Fisheries, 119 Wn.2d 464, \_\_\_\_ P.2d \_\_\_\_ (1992) (5-4 decision). The burden on proving that the regulation is invalid, is on the party challenging it. No challenge has been made directly to the 24 regulation under our standard. However, we believe if it were, the challenged regulation would satisfy the test of Chamber of Commerce. 25 26 ORDER GRANTING RECONSIDERATION AND MODIFYING FINAL ORDER 27 PCHB No. 91-121

(4)

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

1

2

Establish standards for the safe transport, treatment, storage, and disposal of dangerous wastes as may be necessary to protect human health and the environment.

## XIII

Ecology also has the authority under RCW 70.95.060, to adopt minimal functional standards for solid-waste handling. Finally, Ecology has general authority to adopt regulations necessary and appropriate to carry out its duties, which are prescribed by law. RCW 43.21B.064(9), .080.

# XIV

Strong and effective enforcement of federal and state hazardous waste laws and

The regulation is consistent with state and federal law governing dangerous wastes.

These regulations fulfill the purposed of the legislature, which decreed that:

regulations is essential to protect the public health and the environment.

RCW 70.105.005(4). Ecology requires a signed certification from the generator as part of the report. A copy that lacks the signature could hardly be regarded as evidence that the generator was bound by the report. Lack of signature, therefore, could lead persons not personally familiar with the preparation of the report, such as employees, successors, or those dealing with the generator, to disregard statements contained in the report. This would run counter to the emphasis on complete and expeditious disclosure regarding dangerous wastes.

### XV

Based on the foregoing analysis, the Board grants Ecology's motion for reconsideration and ORDERS that the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of law and Order be modified to amend Conclusion of Law XXIV to read as follows:

We conclude Comet Trailer did not keep a copy of its 1987 Form 4 Generator Annual Dangerous Waste Report for three years from the date of that report, in violation of WAC 173-303-210(2). (See Finding of Fact XX.) The

ORDER GRANTING RECONSIDERATION AND MODIFYING FINAL ORDER PCHB No 91-121 (5)

incomplete, unsigned copy of the form submitted at the hearing does not meet the requirements of the rule. WAC 173-303-210(2) requires generators to "keep a copy of each annual report . . . as required by WAC 173-303-220 for a period of at least three years from the due date of each report." (Emphasis added.) WAC 173-303-220(1) requires annual reports to be submitted according to the instructions on the form, which includes a signed certification. WAC 173-303-210(2) can reasonably be interpreted to require a generator to keep a copy of the final, completed form required to be submitted to Ecology. Allowing generators to keep copies of drafts or incomplete forms frustrates the purpose of the recordkeeping requirement.

DONE this 28th day of January, 1993

POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD

JENSEN, Attorney Member

ANNETTE S. MCGEE, Member

DEC 24 1992

POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD STATE OF WASHINGTON

COMET TRAILER MANUFACTURING CORPORATION,

Appellant,

٧.

STATE OF WASHINGTON, DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY,

Respondent.

PCHB No. 91-121

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

Comet Trailer Manufacturing Corporation appealed the Department of Ecology's (Ecology) Order No. DE 90-C280 and Notice of Penalty Incurred and Due No. DE 90-C281, which allege violations of the dangerous waste regulations, chapter 173-303 WAC. The appeals were consolidated. A Stipulation and Agreed Order of Partial Dismissal was entered disposing of the appeal of Order No. DE 90-C280. The Board held a hearing on the appeal of the penalty only.

A formal hearing was held on May 13 and 14, 1992, in Lacey, Washington. Present for the Pollution Control Hearings Board were Harold S. Zimmerman, presiding, Judith Bendor, and Annette McGee. Douglas S. Little of Perkins Cole represented

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER -1-

Comet Trailer. Assistant Attorney General Kathryn L. Gerla represented Ecology. The proceedings were reported by Gene Barker and Associates.

Witnesses were sworn and testified, exhibits were admitted and examined, and post-hearing briefs were submitted. Having reviewed the foregoing, the Board issues the following decision.

# EVIDENTIARY RULINGS

The Department of Ecology filed a Motion in Limine to preclude the submission of certain evidence by Comet Trailer. The Board orally ruled on Ecology's motion prior to the hearing. This decision memorializes the Board's oral ruling.

1. Economic Hardship. Comet Trailer sought to admit testimony and exhibits about the past and present financial position of the company in an effort to persuade this Board to reduce the amount of the penalty. We conclude that such evidence is not relevant, and therefore not admissible. We granted Ecology's motion on this issue and did not consider the evidence.

We have consistently held that economic difficulties cannot excuse a party from complying with environmental laws that all other businesses are expected to follow. See Kenmore Muffler v. Department of Ecology, PCHB No. 85-217 (1986);

American Plating Co. v. Department of Ecology, PCHB No. 84-340

19 i

7 8

(1986); Elliot Lake Water Co. v. Department of Ecology, PCHB
No. 88-20 (1989); Malarkey Asphalt Co. v Department of
Ecology, PCHB No. 85-261 (1986).

Kenmore Muffler and American Plating involved appeals of penalties. In both cases, this Board refused to consider evidence of the company's financial status as a basis for reducing the amount of the penalties, and we affirmed the penalties in full. In dicta, we urged Ecology to consider the financial situation of the companies in determining whether or how to collect the penalties. Although the evidence was admitted in those cases, there is no indication that Ecology moved to exclude that evidence prior to the hearing.

We adhere to our prior decisions. The financial position of a company is not relevant to our review of the penalty imposed by Ecology. It may be a factor for Ecology to consider in determining an appropriate payment schedule for collecting the penalty, but that is outside the scope of our review.

2. Cost of Compliance. Comet Trailer sought to introduce testimony on the expenses it incurred in complying with the order issued by Ecology. We denied Ecology's motion to exclude that evidence. One of the factors we look at in determining if a penalty is excessive is the violator's post-

-3-

violation conduct. The expenditure of money to comply with the order is part of that conduct.

# FINDINGS OF FACT

Ι

Comet Trailer Manufacturing Corporation is in the business of manufacturing truck trailers for the highway transport of commercial goods and wastes. Its manufacturing facility is located in Selah, Washington. The company has operated at that location since November 1984, when it was moved there from Spokane, Washington.

ΙI

The Department of Ecology is a state agency with the statutory responsibility for enforcing the State's dangerous waste laws.

III

In 1985, Ecology issued to Comet Trailer a compliance order and a \$10,000 penalty for violation of the dangerous waste rules. The incident leading to the enforcement action was Comet Trailer's illegal dumping of dangerous waste at the Terrace Heights Landfill in Yakima, Washington. That landfill is not an approved TSD (transfer, treatment, storage, disposal) facility. Comet Trailer improperly disposed of lead-contaminated paint waste and sawdust soaked with the solvent xylene. Prior to Ecology's discovery of the illegal

disposal, Comet Trailer had not obtained a dangerous waste identification number nor designated any of its dangerous wastes.

On appeal, this Board affirmed Ecology's order and penalty, finding Comet Trailer to be in violation of WAC 173-303-060, failure to notify Ecology of dangerous waste generation; WAC 173-303-070, failure to designate dangerous wastes; WAC 173-303-141, disposal of dangerous waste at a facility other than a permitted TSD facility; and WAC 173-303-180, failure to use the dangerous waste manifest system. This Board reduced the amount of the penalty to \$4,000, believing Ecology's efforts had set Comet Trailer on the proper path.

See Comet Trailer Corp. v. Department of Ecology, PCHB 85-151 & 85-189. We take official notice of all facts found by this Board in the 1985 proceeding.

IV

Ecology inspected the Comet Trailer facility again in 1990 and 1991. Beginning in September 1990, Ecology conducted five inspections of the facility over a seven-month period. These inspections led to Ecology's issuance of the penalty and order in the present case (hereinafter "1991 penalty and order").

,

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER

On September 12, 1990, Ecology dangerous waste inspector Jerry French conducted an unannounced inspection of the Comet Trailer facility. The owner of the company, Bud Owens, the plant superintendent, and several other Comet Trailer employees accompanied Ecology's dangerous waste inspector.

VI

Since at least May 1986, Comet Trailer has operated a recycling still to reclaim spent solvents. The still is located inside the manufacturing plant. The company's painting operation produces a mixture of spent xylene and paint. The xylene is reclaimed and used again in Comet Trailer's painting activities. The company stores the paint/xylene mixture waiting to be recycled and the sludge remaining after recycling (still bottoms) in 55-gallon drums.

At the time of the inspection there were 13 55-gallon drums of paint/xylene mixture that had not been recycled and 10 55-gallon drums of still bottoms stored in the area near the still. None of the drums were marked with accumulation dates. The drums containing still bottoms were marked with masking tape on which had been written in felt pen "STILL SOLID WASTE". The remaining drums were not labeled in any fashion. None of the drums had labels identifying the major risks associated with the drums' contents, and none were marked with

6

7

5

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER

the words "dangerous waste" or "hazardous waste". Some of the drums were open. Some were missing bungs. Some of the drums had no ring top fasteners and their lids were lying loose on top of the drums.

There was inadequate aisle space between the drums for the unobstructed movement of personnel and emergency response equipment in the event of a fire, spill, or other emergency. The drums were stored in a location that blocked access to the recycling still by such personnel and equipment.

The plant supervisor stated that the drums had been there for over two years, and that Comet Trailer had not transported off site any of the dangerous wastes the company had generated for the past two years.

## VII

Spent xylene and the still bottoms from the recovery of xylene are listed dangerous wastes (F003) in chapter 173-303 WAC. In October 1990, Comet Trailer hired a hazardous waste consulting company, Chem-Safe Services, Incorporated, to designate and arrange for proper disposal of its dangerous wastes. Chem-Safe designated the still bottoms as extremely hazardous waste. Prior to Chem-Safe's analysis, Comet Trailer had not followed the procedures in the dangerous waste rules

to determine if the spent xylene or the still bottoms designated as dangerous wastes.

# VIII

In August 1985 Comet Trailer submitted to Ecology its first Form 2 Notification of Dangerous Waste Activities. The form stated:

Xylene waste is small and we are studying to see if
it will warrant a small in house recycling unit.
[Exh. R-8]

The form did not indicate Comet Trailer was conducting recycling activities.

Ecology requires that Form 2 Notifications be submitted to the Ecology program headquarters in Lacey, Washington, where the information is kept in one data bank. The 1985 form was the only Form 2 Notification submitted to Ecology prior to issuance of the order and penalty in this case. Comet Trailer did not submit to Ecology a revised Form 2 Notification when it began recycling.

IX

During the September 12 inspection, Ecology's inspector observed additional waste streams produced by Comet Trailer. Comet Trailer uses a polyurethane foam to insulate its refrigerated trailers. The polyurethane foam is made by mixing two compounds, diphenylmethane diisocyanate ("Part A Foam") and trichlorofluoromethane ("Part B Foam"). Each

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER -8-

compound is an extremely hazardous waste. Part A Foam and 1 Part B Foam are stored separately in 2500 gallon tanks. 2 were foam chemical residues on the floor near the tanks and 3 leaks around the valves and flanges of the tanks. 4 the inspection, Comet Trailer had been dumping some of their 5 foam wastes at the Terrace Heights Landfill. Other waste 6 streams observed were: used rags which could be soaked with 7 xylene or other solvents, paint-related material, Part A Foam, 8 or Part B Foam; waste streams from painting activities, such 9 as filters, sludges, residues and floor sweepings; and used 10 oils. Prior to issuance of the 1991 penalty and order, Comet 11 Trailer had not determined if these waste streams were 12 designated as dangerous waste. 13

Х

There

Comet Trailer had indicated on the Form 2 Notification submitted in 1985 that it produced only three types of dangerous wastes, in the following annual amounts: (1) dry oversprayed paint--1200 pounds; (2) xylene--150 pounds; and (3) methylene chloride--150 pounds. The estimated maximum quantity of dangerous wastes generated per month was 125 Based on that information, Ecology determined that Comet Trailer produced dangerous wastes below the quantity exclusion limit (QEL) and was a small quantity generator.

24

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

At some point between the time Comet Trailer submitted its 1985 Form 2 Notification and when Ecology began inspecting the facility in 1990, Comet Trailer had started generating additional types of dangerous wastes and amounts above the QEL, and was no longer a small quantity generator.

After Ecology issued an order requiring the company to designate its wastes, Comet Trailer eventually designated all of the waste streams observed during the September 12 inspection. All of the waste streams except used oil designated as dangerous or extremely hazardous wastes. The Form 2 Notification submitted in November 1991, in response to Ecology's order, identified the following dangerous or extremely hazardous wastes produced by Comet Trailer:

<u>Waste</u>	Waste Number	Annual Quantity
<pre>Xylene, paint related material, sludge</pre>	WT01, D001, F003	3,000 lbs.
Solvex, flammable liquid solvent	D001, WP01, F002, F003	800 lbs.
Non-RCRA waste, dry paint filters, sweepings	WT02	7,200 lbs.
Part A foam, Polymerized M.D.I. Isocyanic Acid Polymethylenepolyphenylene	WT01	120 lbs.
Part B foam, Polyol blend resin component Trichlorofluoromethane	WT01, F002	120 lbs.
Rags with xylene, paint- related material sludge	D001, F003, WT01	120 lbs.
FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER	-10~	

Rags with solvex, solvent, D001, WP01, 120 lbs. Foam A and/or B F002, F003
[Exhibit R-7]

Comet Trailer estimated the maximum quantity it generated per month as 997 pounds. The QEL for these wastes is 220 pounds per month.

XI

At the time of the September 12 inspection, a number of 55-gallon drums and 5-gallon pails were stored in the parking lot outside the building, in the northeast corner of the property. Mr. French observed that the drums were not marked with accumulation dates or the words "dangerous waste" or "hazardous waste". They did not contain labels identifying the major risks associated with the drums' contents, and some drums were open. Ecology did not conduct a full inspection of the area at that time because the Comet Trailer personnel accompanying Mr. French did not know what was stored in that area. Mr. French was told he needed to talk with the company president and hazardous waste manager, Steve Owens, who was then unavailable.

XII

During the course of the inspection, the inspector pointed out to those accompanying him the dangerous waste rule violations as he observed them. The Comet Trailer personnel did not appear to be familiar with the regulation

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER -11-

1<del>9</del> 

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER -12-

requirements. The inspector also conducted an exit interview with Bud Owens discussing the problems seen and suggesting Mr. Owens hire a dangerous waste consultant.

# IIIX

Mr. French again inspected the Comet Trailer facility on September 25, 1990, accompanied by Steve Owens. In the area of the recycling still Mr. French observed the same drums he had seen on his previous inspection. The problems earlier noted had not been corrected. The drums were in the same location, they did not have dangerous waste labels, and some were open. An incorrect accumulation date had been written on the drums in ink pen. The accumulation date written was a date sometime after September 12, 1990. Steve Owens indicated that the drums had been at that location for over two years. We find it more likely than not that this dangerous waste had been on site for at least two years.

Mr. French discussed with Steve Owens the additional undesignated waste streams he had earlier observed inside the building (see Finding of Fact IX) and the need to designate those.

# XIV

One hundred sixty-nine drums and 23 5-gallon pails, either partially or completely full, were stored in the parking lot in the northeast corner of the property. At the

time of the inspection, Steve Owens identified the contents as xylene/paint mixture and still bottoms, paint and other floor sweepings, used oil, paint, and trichlorofluoromethane.

Twelve additional drums contained undercoating tar (Tectyl 121-B) residues. Mr. Owens did not know if any of the materials were dangerous wastes.

None of the containers were marked with a label indicating the major risks associated with the contents of the containers. None of the containers were marked with the words "hazardous waste" or "dangerous waste", and none were marked with an accumulation date. Some of the containers were open: some had no lids, some were missing bungs, and some did not have ring top fasteners.

Some of the 5-gallon pails of paint were severely corroded and appeared to the inspector to have been there for quite some time. Comet Trailer brought some of the paint from Spokane in 1984. Its shelf life had expired and it was hard and unusable. Some of the pails of paint were open to dust, rain, and other elements. During the inspection, Ecology took a sample from a 5-gallon pail of paint that had no lid. It tested at 24.4 parts per million for lead, and designated as dangerous waste. In 1984, Comet Trailer was using lead-based paint. After Ecology issued the penalty and compliance order in 1985, the company began using primarily non-leaded paint.

However, approximately 10 percent of the paint Comet Trailer continues to use is lead-based.

ΧV

The parking lot on which the containers were stored is bordered on the north by the Selah sewage treatment plant and on the east by the outflow channel from the Selah plant. outflow channel flows into the Yakima River approximately a mile to the south. The area of the parking lot where the containers were stored slopes down to a storm drain catch basın about 75 to 85 feet away. The contents of the catch basin empty into the outflow channel. The storage area had no containment system to catch spills or leaks. The containers were stacked near the property boundary of the sewage treatment plant. There was a danger that the containers could spill onto the sewage treatment plant property or into the catch basin and eventually into the Yakima River, posing a threat to human health and the environment. sludge samples from the catch basin taken by Ecology in May 1991 detected, among other things, truchlorofluromethane and xylene, which were stored in the parking lot. The Comet Trailer facility is also in a 100-year flood zone, as determined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

The parking lot where the containers were stored was frequented by truck traffic. There were no signs indicating

25

26

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER -14-

the area was a dangerous waste storage area. There were no barriers to prevent vehicles from colliding with the dangerous waste containers. There was no communication or alarm system immediately accessible to personnel at the storage area, nor was there any available fire control, spill control or decontamination equipment.

IVX

Sometime after the September 25 inspection Chem-Safe analyzed the materials stored in the parking lot. Prior to Chem-Safe's analysis Comet Trailer had not designated these materials. With the exception of 39 drums of used oil Chem-Safe designated all the materials as dangerous or extremely hazardous wastes.

The materials in the parking lot were eventually transported under dangerous waste manifests to permitted TSD facilities. On October 17, 1990, 9,595 pounds of xylene paint sludge, 816 pounds of Tectyl 121-B undercoating tar, and 228 pounds of Tectyl 342 white paint were shipped to Sol-Pro, Inc. On November 11, 1990, 1,500 pounds of Autofroth Component A and sawdust were shipped to Chem-Pro, Inc. On November 20, 1990, 1,111 pounds of xylene paint sludge were sent to Sol-Pro, and 1,050 pounds of Vultrafoam Part A were sent to Chem-Pro. On December 14, 1990, 8,000 pounds of paint/flcor sweepings were shipped to EnviroSafe Services.

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER -15-

\_\_

. 

Comet Trailer challenges the designation of the paint/
floor sweepings. Comet Trailer's consultant from Chem-Safe
designated these sweepings, and later testified that based on
the information he had it was most likely the sweepings
designate as dangerous waste. Comet Trailer has provided no
evidence that the paint sweepings do not designate. We find
that the paint sweepings designate as dangerous waste.

# XVII

We find that at the time of the inspection, the materials stored in the parking lot had been accumulating on site for two years, and had been on site for more than 90 days. At the hearing Comet Trailer conceded that some of its still bottoms and dry paint waste had been on site for more than 90 days, since May 1990.

#### IIIVX

Comet Trailer has never received a permit from Ecology to operate a dangerous waste storage facility.

The 1985 Form 2 Notification submitted by Comet Trailer did not indicate that the company was operating as a dangerous waste storage facility. Comet Trailer did not submit to Ecology a revised Form 2 Notification when it began operating as a storage facility.

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER -16-

The first time Comet Trailer ever shipped its dangerous waste to a TSD facility was in October 1990. Prior to that time, since 1984, the company had continued to dispose of some of its xylene still bottoms and dry paint sweepings at the Terrace Heights Landfill. Comet Trailer had assumed these wastes were not dangerous wastes, but had not designated them in accordance with the procedures in WAC 173-303-070. Comet Trailer assumed the paint sweepings would not designate because the company had switched to mostly lead-free paint. Comet Trailer assumed the still bottoms were not dangerous waste because the company that sold Comet Trailer the recycling still said the still bottoms could be disposed of at the local landfill.

XX

During the September 25 inspection, Comet Trailer was unable to produce a copy of its 1987 Form 4 Generator Annual Dangerous Waste Report. At the time of the inspection, Steve Owens indicated Comet Trailer did not have a copy. The due date of the report was March 1, 1988.

At the hearing, Comet Trailer produced a copy of a 1987

Form 4, which Steve Owens testified had been misplaced at the time of the inspection. The section of the form that required a signed certification under penalty of perjury was not signed

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER -17-

on the form submitted. Mr. Owens changed his story several times during questioning at the hearing, and we do not find his testimony to be credible. We also do not find the Form 4 submitted at the hearing to be a copy of the signed Form 4 submitted to Ecology. We find that Comet Trailer failed to keep a copy of the 1987 Form 4 Annual Dangerous Waste Report submitted to Ecology for three years from the due date of the report.

### IXX

During the inspection, the Ecology inspector pointed out the violations of dangerous waste rules as they were discovered. He also conducted an exit interview and provided Steve Owens with a copy of the dangerous waste regulations.

# IIXX

On October 1, 1990, Ecology wrote a letter to Comet
Trailer indicating that the drums of waste observed during the
September 12 and 25 inspections were subject to all applicable
requirements of the dangerous waste regulations. The letter
also indicated Ecology would be sending a second letter
informing Comet Trailer of the results of the previous
inspections. Ecology did not send the second letter.

#### IIIXX

Ecology inspector French again visited the Comet Trailer facility on October 16, 1990, to inspect the removal of the

drums of dangerous waste. Chem-Safe was preparing for transport 35 of the dangerous waste containers located in the parking lot outside.

A number of containers of dangerous waste still remained in the northeast corner of the parking lot that Chem-Safe was not transporting. The problems observed by Ecology during the prior inspection had not been corrected. The containers were stored in the same place and manner as on the previous inspection. (See Finding of Fact XV.) This material had not been designated. The inspector observed 21 full or partially full 55-gallon drums marked with masking tape labels that read "XYLENE TO BE STILLED". There were 45 full or partially full 55-gallon drums of dry paint sweepings, floor sweepings, foam wastes and sawdust. Several of these containers had no lids, no ringtop fasteners, or no bungs. There were no markings or labels on the drums. Ninety-six 5-gallon containers of paint or paint-related material remained on site. containers were severely corroded and several were not closed. There were also 10 5-gallon pails labeled "DAP caulking", and 16 55-gallon drums whose contents were unknown. One of the drums had "SOLVENT" and three had "SOAP" written on them in chalk. None of the containers were marked with accumulation dates, none had labels identifying the major risks associated

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

with the drums' contents, and none were marked with the words "dangerous waste" or "hazardous waste".

These materials were eventually designated as dangerous waste by Comet Trailer and transported to TSD facilities.

### XXIV

At the conclusion of the inspection, the inspector conducted an exit interview with Steve Owens and informed him of the problems seen and what Comet Trailer needed to do to correct them. Mr. French mentioned his concern that a large number of containers were remaining on site. Mr. Owens indicated he was concerned with costs of analyzing the wastes and that the cost would determine whether he was going to test any more of the waste.

#### **VXX**

Ecology inspector French next inspected the Comet Trailer facility on December 14, 1990. Chem-Safe was preparing 27 more drums of dangerous waste for transport. In the northeast corner of the parking lot there remained several full drums of xylene/paint waste, several drums of Part A foam and of Part B foam, several drums of paint overspray waste, and numerous 5-gallon pails of paint stacked on pallets. Chem-Safe was not preparing these containers for transport. The drums of foam waste and paint overspray, and several of the pails of paint had no lids. Some of the paint pails had lids that were not

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER -20-

None of the containers were marked with firmly attached. accumulation dates, none had labels identifying the major risks associated with the drums' contents, and none were marked with the words "dangerous waste" or "hazardous waste".

Inspector French conducted an exit interview with the company owner, Bud Owens, in which he again explained the dangerous waste rule violations observed and the necessary corrective actions. Mr. French indicated he was drafting an enforcement order and possibly a penalty. Mr. Owens responded by stating that Comet Trailer was a large business, produced a lot of products, had a payroll of over a million dollars, and if Ecology wanted to issue enforcement actions, to go ahead.

#### IVXX

Ecology's final inspection prior to its enforcement action occurred on March 11, 1991. Steve Owens accompanied Jerry French on the inspection. Forty to 50 full or partially full 55-gallon drums and 5-gallon pails of paint were still stored in the northeast corner of the parking lot. the drums were not labeled to identify their contents. Steve Owens was unable to identify their contents. These materials had not been designated. None of the containers were marked with accumulation dates or with hazardous waste labels. of the containers were open: they had no lids, no bungs, or no ring top fasteners. One drum which had no lid appeared to

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER -21-

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER

the inspector to contain floor sweepings. There was still no secondary containment system in place to contain spills.

# IIVXX

During the inspection, the inspector asked Steve Owens to identify the contents of one unlabeled, open drum. Mr. Owens did not know the contents of the drum. He tipped it over and spilled approximately one gallon of the liquid contents on the ground. He ran his fingers through it, smelled it, and then pointed to the stenciled words "TELLUS OIL" on the drum. It is unknown whether this material was dangerous waste.

When asked by the Ecology inspector, Steve Owens did not know what to do in the event of an accidental spill in this drum storage area.

During the March inspection, Mr. French took samples from sandblast piles located on the property. Prior to taking the samples, Steve Owens gathered a pile of sandblast material in his hands, dumped it on the ground at Mr. French's feet, and stated "here's your sample". These sandblast piles were later determined by Ecology to exceed cleanup standards under the Model Toxics Control Act.

# IIIVXX

At the time of Ecology's inspections, Comet Trailer did not have a written inspection schedule for inspecting the facility and was not regularly inspecting the facility or

container storage areas. After Ecology issued the 1991 order and penalty, Comet Trailer developed an inspection schedule and began weekly inspections of its container storage areas.

#### XXXX

Prior to issuance of the 1991 order and penalty, Comet Trailer did not have a written training plan, and did not have a personnel training program to teach personnel dangerous waste management requirements and how to respond to emergencies.

From at least 1984 until Ecology's inspections in 1990, Comet Trailer's president, Steve Owens, was the company's hazardous waste manager, responsible for ensuring compliance with the hazardous waste laws. Mr. Owens held that position during the period of the previous dangerous waste violations Between 1985 and Ecology's inspections in 1990, Comet Trailer did not have on staff anyone with expertise in dangerous waste management nor did the company hire a consultant. Mr. Owens has had no formal training and does not have expertise in dangerous waste management. actions taken by Comet Trailer to become familiar with the requirements of hazardous waste laws between 1985 and Ecology's inspections in 1990, was Mr. Owens' reading of the state dangerous waste regulations in order to fill out the annual reporting forms.

25

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER -23-

After the 1991 penalty and order were issued, Comet

Trailer eventually implemented a personnel training program in

compliance with Ecology's order.

### XXX

Prior to issuance of the 1991 penalty and order, Comet Trailer did not have any contingency plan for use in emergencies that contained the information described in WAC 173-303-350(3). After Ecology issued the 1991 order and penalty, Comet Trailer developed a contingency plan, in compliance with the order.

#### XXXI

Prior to issuance of the 1991 penalty and order, Comet
Trailer did not have an emergency coordinator responsible for
coordinating all emergency response measures. After Ecology
issued the 1991 order and penalty, Comet Trailer designated
Glenn Collins, the company's secretary-treasurer, as the
emergency coordinator, in compliance with the order.

#### XXXII

Prior to issuance of the 1991 penalty and order, Comet
Trailer had not made any of the arrangements with local
authorities for emergency purposes listed in WAC 173-303340(4). After the order and penalty were issued, Comet
Trailer made such arrangements, in compliance with the order.

1	XXXIII	
2	On April 17, 1991, Ecology issued a regulatory order (DE	
3	90-C280) and penalty (DE 90-C281). The penalty listed the	
4	following violations:	
5	WAC 173-303-060(2) Failure to notify the Department of changes in type of dangerous waste activities.	
7	WAC 173-303-070 Failure to designate a solid waste as also being a dangerous waste.	
9	WAC 173-303-200(1)(a) Failure to comply with 90-day storage requirements.	
10 11	WAC 173-303-200(1)(b) Failure to properly use and manage containers of dangerous waste, including;	
12	WAC 173-303-630(5) Failure to properly manage containers of dangerous waste.	
13	WAC 173-303-200(1)(c) Failure to mark the date upon which each period of accumulation began on each container of dangerous waste.	
15	WAC 173-303-200(1)(d) Farlure to identify the contents and major(s) associated with the dangerous wastes in each container.	
17	WAC 173-303-200(e) Failure to comply with facility requirements for generators, including;	
19 20	WAC 173-303-320(2) Failure to develop a written inspection plan.	
21	WAC 173-303-330(1) Failure to provide a training program WAC 173-303-330(2) for facility personnel.	
23	WAC 173-303-340 Failure to implement preparedness and prevention measures.	
24		
25	DINAL DINDINGS OF FACE	
26	FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER -25-	

1 2		ailure to develop a written contingency and emergency procedures clan.	
3	f	Tailure to have emergency coordinator(s) with responsibility or coordinating all emergency esponse measures.	
6	WAC 173-303-210(2) F	ailure to retain copy of 1987 Annual eport for a period of three years rom the due date of that report.	
8	WAC 173-303-950(2)	perating a dangerous waste storage acility without a permit.	
9	Order DE 90-C280 identified the same violations and		
10	required corrective actions for those violations.		
11	On May 16, 1991, Comet Trailer filed an appeal of the		
12	order and penalty. The pa	rties entered into a stipulated	
13	dismissal of the appeal of that order, compliance having been		
14	achieved on all requirements except for several requirements		

### VIXXX

that Ecology had walved. The parties did not stipulate as to

the timeliness of Comet Trailer's compliance with the order.

Comet Trailer spent approximately \$35,000 to \$40,000 complying with Order DE 90-C280. Comet Trailer paid \$30,000 to Chem-Safe Services, Inc. for its services in designating and arranging for proper transportation of the dangerous wastes stored on site. Glenn Collins testified that the remainder constituted the cost to the company of providing

24

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

in-house training. This included the cost of the employees'
time spent in training.

## VXXX ·

Any Conclusion of Law deemed to be a Finding of Fact is hereby adopted as such.

From these Findings of Fact the Board makes these:

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Ι

The Board has jurisdiction over these parties and the subject matter of this action. RCW 43.21B.300; chapter 70.105 RCW.

ΙI

The xylene still bottoms, the xylene/paint mixture stored prior to recycling, the paint floor sweepings, and the Autofroth Component A mixed with sawdust were "dangerous wastes" as defined in WAC 173-303-040(18).

III

Comet Trailer contends the paint, undercoating tar,

Part A foam, and Part B foam stored in the parking lot were

not wastes at the time of Ecology's initial inspections, but

were products which only became wastes when later discarded by

Comet Trailer.

A "solid waste" is any discarded material that is not excluded by rule or by a variance granted by Ecology. WAC

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER -27-

6 7

5

8 9

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER -28-

173-303-016(3)(a). A discarded material includes any material that is abandoned. WAC 173-303-016(3)(b)(i). Abandoned materials include those that are disposed of, or are "[a]ccumulated, stored, or treated (but not recycled) before or in lieu of being abandoned by being disposed of, burned, or incinerated". WAC 173-303-016(4)(a), (c).

A material may also be a solid waste based on its threat to human health and the environment. WAC 173-303-016(b)(11) states in pertinent part:

A material which is not defined as a solid waste in this section, or is not a dangerous waste identified or listed in this section, is still a solid waste and a dangerous waste for purposes of these sections if reason and authority exists under chapter 70.105 RCW and WAC 173-303-960. Within the constraints of chapter 70.105 RCW, this shall include but not be limited to any material that: Is accumulated, used, reused, or handled in a manner that poses a threat to public health or the environment[.] . . .

The paint, undercoating tar, Part A foam, and Part B foam were all stored outside, uncovered. Some of the paint stored on site had been moved there from Spokane in 1984 and was no longer useable. Some of the pails were severely corroded, and some were left open to evaporation and contamination by dust, rain and other elements. Photographs taken by Ecology also show open drums of Part A foam and Part B foam. The manner in which this material was accumulated posed a threat to public health and the environment. (See Finding of Fact XV.) materials were eventually disposed of by Comet Trailer.

We conclude that at the time of Ecology's inspections, these materials were being accumulated or stored before or in lieu of being abandoned by disposal, and were solid wastes under WAC 173-303-016(3)(a), (b)(1), and WAC 173-303-016(4)(c). We also conclude these materials constituted solid waste under WAC 173-303-016(b)(ii). $^{2}$ 

IV

The paint, undercoating tar, Part A foam, and Part B foam were "dangerous wastes", as defined in WAC 173-303-040(18).

v

Small quantity generators are exempt from most of the requirements of chapter 173-303 WAC. WAC 173-303-070(8)(b). A generator is a small quantity generator if his waste is designated as dangerous waste and

the quantity of waste that he generates, accumulates, or stores (or the aggregated quantity if he generates more than one kind of waste) does not exceed the quantity exclusion limit for such waste (or wastes). If a person generates, accumulates, or stores any dangerous wastes that exceed the QEL, then all dangerous waste generated, accumulated, or stored by that person is subject to the requirements of this chapter [173-303 WAC].

WAC 173-303-070(8)(a).

<sup>2</sup>Even were we to have found these materials were not 23 solid wastes that would not change our decision. would still have proven each of the violations alleged in the penalty, and our decision regarding the reasonableness of the

penalty would remain the same.

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER

21

20

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

24

**25** i

6 i

The quantity exclusion limit for the dangerous wastes generated and accumulated by Comet Trailer was 220 pounds per month. At the time of Ecology's inspections, Comet Trailer was generating and had accumulated dangerous wastes in excess of the 220-pound QEL, was not a small quantity generator, and was fully subject to the dangerous waste rules.

# Notification of Dangerous Waste Activities

VI

WAC 173-303-060(2) requires every person with an EPA/state identification number to "submit a revised notification Form 2 to the department prior to any changes to his company's . . . type of dangerous waste activity." Comet Trailer began operating a storage facility when it accumulated dangerous waste on site beyond the 90-day limit in the rules.

See WAC 173-303-200. See also Conclusion of Law IX, infra. Comet Trailer violated WAC 173-303-060(2) by failing to submit a revised notification Form 2 to Ecology when it began operating as a storage facility.

VII

Comet Trailer violated WAC 173-303-060(2) by failing to submit a revised notification Form 2 to Ecology when the company began recycling dangerous wastes.

We are not persuaded by Comet Trailer's argument that it met the requirements of the rule by virtue of the fact that

both Ecology and this Board knew Comet Trailer was conducting recycling, as it was an issue in the 1985 hearing. All Form 2 notifications must be sent to Ecology program headquarters where, for obvious reasons, the information is kept in a central data bank. Just as the membership of this Board changes, so does Ecology's staff. Oral or other alternative means of notification is not sufficient. The plain language of the rule requires submission of a revised form.

## <u>Designation</u>

WAC 173-303-070 requires a generator of solid waste that is not exempted or excluded from the dangerous waste rules to determine whether or not that waste is dangerous waste. The rule establishes required designation procedures. At the time of Ecology's inspections in September 1990, Comet Trailer had not designated any of the dangerous waste stored near the recycling still or in the parking lot. Comet Trailer did not designate numerous additional waste streams that it generated until November 1991, more than a year after Ecology's first inspections and seven months after Ecology issued its regulatory order. Comet Trailer violated WAC 173-303-070.

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER -31-

# Storage/Accumulation

A generator may only accumulate dangerous waste on site without a permit for ninety days or less after the date of generation. WAC 173-303-200(1), (2)(a). A generator that accumulates dangerous waste for longer than 90 days becomes an operator of a storage facility, and is subject to the facility and permit requirements of the rules. WAC 173-303-200(1)(a).

Comet Trailer accumulated dangerous waste on site for two years without a permit, in violation of WAC 173-303-200(1)(a) and WAC 173-303-950(2).

# Container Use and Management

Х

WAC 173-303-200(1)(b) requires generators who accumulate dangerous waste on site without a permit to comply with certain requirements in WAC 173-303-630. WAC 173-303-630(5)(a) requires that containers holding dangerous waste always be closed, except when it is necessary to add or remove waste. Comet Trailer repeatedly violated WAC 173-303-200(1)(b) and -630(5)(a) by having containers of dangerous waste on site with no bungs, no lids, or no ring top fasteners fastening the lids to the drums.

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER -32-

WAC 173-303-630(5)(b) states that containers of dangerous waste must not be opened, handled or stored in a manner that may rupture the containers or cause them to leak. Comet Trailer violated this rule, and by reference WAC 173-303-200(1)(b), by storing numerous containers of dangerous waste in an unsafe manner: in its parking lot with no warning signs or barriers to prevent collisions by vehicles. See Penberthy Electromett, International v. Department of Ecology, PCHB No. 90-136 (1992).

#### XII

Comet Trailer violated WAC 173-303-630(6) and by reference WAC 173-303-200(1)(b) by failing to weekly inspect the areas where containers of dangerous waste were stored.

# XIII

WAC 173-303-200(1)(b) requires new container accumulation areas constructed or installed after September 30, 1986, to comply with the secondary containment requirements in WAC 173-303-630(7). Comet Trailer violated these rules by not having a secondary containment system for the container storage area in the parking lot.

#### XIV

Comet Trailer violated WAC 173-303-200(1)(c) by failing to mark on any of the containers of dangerous waste near the

recycling still and in the parking lot the date on which the period of accumulation for each container began.

xv

Comet Trailer violated WAC 173-303-200(1)(d) by not marking on each container of dangerous waste near the recycling still and in the parking lot the words "dangerous waste" or "hazardous waste". Comet Trailer also violated this rule and WAC 173-303-630(3) by not marking each dangerous waste container with a label that identified the major risks associated with the waste in the container for employees, emergency response personnel and the public.

## <u>Facility</u>

### XVI

WAC 173-303-200(1)(e) requires generators who accumulate dangerous waste on site without a permit to comply with the requirements for facility operators in WAC 173-303-330 through 173-303+360. WAC 173-303-320(1) requires an owner or operator to inspect the facility for malfunctions and deterioration, operator errors, and discharges which may lead to the release of dangerous waste to the environment or a threat to human health. Areas subject to spills must be inspected daily when in use. WAC 173-303-320(2)(c). WAC 173-303-320(2) requires a written inspection schedule, and WAC 173-303-320(3) requires the owner or operator to remedy any problems revealed by the

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER -34-

8 ! 

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER -35

inspection. Comet Trailer violated these rules. It did not have a written inspection schedule and was not regularly inspecting the facility.

## XVII

Comet Trailer violated WAC 173-303-330(1) by not having a personnel training program to teach personnel how to perform their duties in compliance with the dangerous waste rules and how to respond to emergencies.

### IIIVX

Comet Trailer violated WAC 173-303-330(2) by not developing a written training plan.

### XVIX

The dangerous waste storage area in the parking lot had no communication or alarm system immediately accessible to personnel, nor any available fire control, spill control or decontamination equipment. Comet Trailer violated WAC 173-303-340(1)(a), (1)(c), and (2)(a).

## XX

Comet Trailer violated WAC 173-303-340(4) by not making the arrangements with local authorities listed in -340(4)(a), (b), (c) and (d).

## XXI

Comet Trailer violated WAC 173-303-340(3) by not maintaining sufficient aisle space near the recycling still to

allow the unobstructed movement of personnel, fire protection 1 equipment, spill control equipment, and decontamination 2 equipment in the event of an emergency. 3 IIXX Comet Trailer did not have a contingency plan at its 5 facility for use in emergencies or sudden or nonsudden 6 releases, in violation of WAC 173-303-350(2). 7 XXIII 8 Comet Trailer violated WAC 173-303-360(1) by not having 9 an emergency coordinator. 10 VIXX 11 Recordkeeping 12 13 14 VXX 15 We conclude Ecology has proven by a preponderance of the 16 evidence that each of the violations alleged in Notice of 17 Penalty Incurred and Due No. DE 90-C281 occurred. 18 Penalty Amount: 19 20 IVXX 21 RCW 70.105.080(2) authorizes penalties of up to \$10,000 22 per day for each violation of the dangerous waste rules. Each 23 violation is a separate and distinct offense, and each day's 24 25 FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, 26

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER

continuance of an ongoing violation constitutes a separate offense. RCW 70.105.080(2). The Board reviews de novo the appropriateness of the penalty amount.

The factors we look at in reviewing the appropriateness of a civil penalty include the nature of the violations, including severity and extent; the prior behavior of the violator; actions taken after the violations to solve the problem, particularly those actions taken prior to issuance of an order; and the maximum amount of penalty assessment possible. Northwest Processing, Inc. v. Department of Ecology, PCHB No. 89-141 & 143 (1991).

## IIVXX

Comet Trailer was in violation of numerous dangerous waste regulations. Ecology's inspector testified that this was the most egregious situation he had seen in terms of total noncompliance with the regulations. These were continuing violations. Some had been occurring for years prior to Ecology's inspections, such as the designation and accumulation violations. Some violations continued to occur throughout the period of the five inspections, such as the container management and designation violations.

The violations were also very serious. Comet Trailer had been storing large quantities of dangerous and extremely hazardous waste for a significant period of time. Some of the

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER -37

2 | 

15 | 16 |

containers were corroded, and some were open. Some of the dangerous waste was stored outside in an unsafe place and manner. The dangerous waste containers were not labeled, and Comet Trailer personnel were not familiar with what was in the Nor was the personnel familiar with the requirements of the dangerous waste regulations. Trailer provided no training and had no emergency response system in place. The company's designated hazardous waste manager did not know what to do in the event of an emergency. His actions during the inspections reveal either a complete lack of understanding or of respect for the seriousness of the company's dangerous waste management practices and the need 12 for compliance with the regulations. These violations could 13 readily have resulted in a spill to the environment, with the potential to reach the Yakima River, and could have endangered 15 the health of Comet Trailer personnel and the public. 16 In addition, Comet Trailer's continued failure to 17 designate its wastes has resulted in, among other things, 18 dangerous waste being disposed of at the local landfill. 19

we noted in our prior Comet Trailer decision, the designation requirements are at the very heart of the dangerous waste regulatory scheme. Comet Trailer's failure to designate has again resulted in dangerous waste ending up being disposed of at the wrong place. See Comet Trailer v. Department of

25

26

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER -381 2 3

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER -39-

Ecology, PCHB No. 85-151, 159, at 21 (1986). Comet Trailer's violations were systemic and significant. The regulations violated were neither arcane nor esoteric. See Northwest Processing, supra.

Comet Trailer argues the penalty should be mitigated because no environmental damage occurred. Even if we assume that to be the case, it is the <u>potential</u> harm from violations that the law seeks to eliminate. Ross Electric, Inc. v. <u>Department of Ecology</u>, PCHB No. 86-225 (1989).

## IIIVXX

Looking at the prior behavior of the violator, Comet
Trailer received a compliance order and \$4,000 penalty in 1985
for violation of the dangerous waste regulations. That
penalty involved some of the same types of violations and
dangerous wastes at issue in this proceeding. Comet Trailer
had failed to designate xylene-soaked sawdust and leadcontaminated dry paint waste, resulting in its disposal at the
local landfill. During the course of that proceeding, both
Ecology and this Board emphasized to Comet Trailer the
importance of the designation process. Comet Trailer v.
Department of Ecology, supra, at 7, 10, 21. The designation
procedures were discussed. We noted at the time of the
decision that Comet Trailer still had not designated its
paint, solvent and other products it used in order to

19<sup>-</sup> 

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER -40-

definitively resolve the question whether its present wastes were regulated as dangerous wastes. <u>Comet Trailer</u>, at 14. While we characterized Comet Trailer's approach to designation as recalcitrant, we found that it was not a repeat offender, but a slow learner. <u>Comet Trailer</u>, at 21-22.

Five years later, in 1990, Comet Trailer had still not designated its wastes, and had continued to dispose of the same types of wastes at the local landfill. Between 1985 and 1990, Comet Trailer had done virtually nothing to learn or bring itself into compliance with the dangerous waste regulations. We now find Comet Trailer to be a repeat offender and its actions to be inexcusable.

### XIVXX

The actions taken by Comet Trailer after the violations and during the period of the inspections do not weigh heavily in favor of mitigation. Ecology conducted five inspections over a seven-month period. During each inspection, Ecology provided oral notices of the violations. On each inspection some of the same violations were noted, such as the failure to designate wastes and the container management violations. We do not believe that Ecology's failure to submit a letter detailing the violations to be a cause of those continued violations, as Comet Trailer alleges. The violations involved

were not technical. Comet Trailer had ample notice of the violations.

Comet Trailer has eventually brought itself into compliance with the regulations and Ecology's compliance order. On balance, this does not outweigh the other factors considered. Because no prior permit is required from Ecology to operate solely as a generator, it is essential that generators voluntarily learn and comply with the regulations.

#### XXX

Comet Trailer violated 23 separate provisions of the dangerous waste regulations. Assuming only one day's violation of each of those, Ecology could have issued a penalty of \$230,000. Some of the violations had been occurring for several years. If Ecology had counted each day's continuance of each violation as a separate violation, the maximum penalty would have been astronomical.

In light of all the facts and circumstances, we believe the \$94,000 to be reasonable.

#### XXXI

Any Finding of Fact which is deemed a Conclusion of Law is hereby adopted as such.

From these Conclusions of Law the Board enters the following

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER -41-

## ORDER

The Notice of Penalty Incurred and Due No. 90-C281 in the amount of \$94,000 is AFFIRMED. \$44,000 of the penalty is suspended provided that Comet Trailer does not violate any state hazardous waste laws for three years from the date of issuance of the final order.

DONE this 3/st day of

, 1992.

POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD

MAROLD S. ZIMMERMAN, Presiding

ANNETTE S. McGEE, Member

720/comet ffe

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER -42